

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/412,618

Applicant(s)

GOTHAIT, HANAN

Examiner

Kidest Bahta

Art Unit

2125

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kidest Bahta.

(3) Caleb Pollack.

(2) Leo Picard.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 13 May 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 30,34 and 36.

Identification of prior art discussed: Penn and Hull.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the differences between the Penn '652 and Hull '169 reference and the current Application with respect to what is meant by combining the first and second photopolymer materials in a variably selectable prportion. Agreed that argument and amendments would be presented to particularly point out the differences.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required